



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/116,804	11/06/87	LA FLEUP	A #002

BARNES, KISSELLE, RAISCH, CHGATE,
WHITTEMORE & HULBERT
1520 FORD BUILDING
DETROIT, MI 48226

EXAMINER	
LITTLE, W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
241	2

DATE MAILED:

02/16/88

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☒ Claims 24-26 are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1, 3, 13, 17, AND 18 are rejected.
5. ☒ Claims 2, 4-12, 14-16, AND 19-23 are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

Art Unit 241

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-3, 13, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Isbrandtsen in view of Derby et al.

Since flexible and collapsible bulk containers are old and well-known in the art, as shown by Derby et al, it would be an obvious variation of Isbrandtsen's teachings to replace his outer container (10) with such a flexible liner connected to the interior thereof.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Becker et al. It would be obvious, in view of Becker et al's teachings to provide Isbrandtsen's inner liner with at least four connector means.

Claims 4-12 and 19-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

Serial No. 118304

-3-

Art Unit 241

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 24-26 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The following references of interest are cited:


Fell et al, '402 and '284 , Futerman, and Yamaha et al - each showing a liner with a connector attached thereto.

Little-org

(703) 557-2900

2/10/88

2/12/88


ELLIS LITTLE
MARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT C